

## REMARKS

1. In response to the Office Action mailed October 19, 2006, Applicants respectfully requests reconsideration. Claims 1-56 were originally presented in the application. In the outstanding Office Action, all claims have been rejected. By the foregoing Amendments, claims 1, 14, 16, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 39, 40, 43 and 44 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. Thus, upon entry of this paper, claims 1-56 will be pending in this application. Of these fifty-six (56) claims, ten (10) claims (claims 1, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55) are independent. Based on the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that all outstanding objections and rejections be reconsidered, and that they be withdrawn.

### *Claim Amendments*

2. The amendments to claims 1, 14, 16, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36, 43 and 44 have been made to clarify grammatical inconsistencies. The amendments to claims 39 and 40 have been made to clarify the dependency of these claims. No new matter has been added.

### *Art of Record*

3. Applicants acknowledge receipt of form PTO-892 identifying additional references made of record by the Examiner.

### *Acceptance of Drawings*

4. Applicants request that the Examiner indicates on the next official communication whether the formal drawings filed on July 30, 2003 are deemed acceptable.

### *Allowed Claim*

5. Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that claim 13 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Claim Rejections under Section 112***

5. Dependent claims 39-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Applicants have amended claims 39 and 40 to clarify that these claims depend from claim 36 and not claim 16.

***Claim Rejections under Section 101***

6. Dependent claims 39-44 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 because the subject matter is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have amended claims 39 and 40 to clarify that these claims depend from claim 36 and not claim 16.

***Claim Rejections under Section 102***

7. Independent claims 1, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55 and dependent claims 2-13, 15-27, 29-34, 36-44, 46, 48, 51-52, 54 and 56 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,028,192 to Butler (hereinafter, "Butler"). Also, independent claims 1, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55 and dependent claims 2-12, 15-27, 29-34, 36-44, 46, 48, 51-52, 54 and 56 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0182614 to Schroeder (hereinafter, "Schroeder"). Based upon the above Amendments and following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

8. Independent claim 1 currently recites the steps of "***fragmenting the original key string*** into a plurality of key fragments," "calculating for each key fragment corresponding ***check data***" and "***combining each key fragment with its corresponding check data*** to form said error-detectable key fragments." (See, Applicants' claim 1 above; emphasis added). The Office Action alleges that FIG. 2 of Butler for teaching these steps. (See, Office Action, page 4). Applicants respectively disagree. First, Butler uses a hash function on a password to generate an N-bit number, which is split into groups. (See, Butler Col. 5, lines 12-18). The N-bit number of Butler is not the original key string as claimed, but rather an output of a hash function. Second, Butler does not calculate corresponding check data for each key fragment as claimed. Instead, Butler uses a look-up table to match each group of split N-bit numbers with words. (See, Butler Col. 5, lines 15-20). The words are not check data as alleged by the Office Action. Instead the words are used by the user to verify a password. Finally,

Butler fails to teach combining the fragment with the corresponding check data to form error-detectable key fragments as claimed. Instead, Butler presents only the words that correspond to each group of split N-bit number to the user to verify a password. (*See*, Butler Col. 5, lines 20-27). The words and the fragments in Butler are not combined, but rather the words represent the fragments. Therefore, nothing in Butler teaches or suggests any of the recited steps of claim 1 and therefore claim 1 is patentable over Butler.

9. Independent claims 14, 28, 35, 45 and 50 contain similar claim features and are patentable over Butler for similar reasons as claim 1.

10. Independent claim 47 currently recites the features of “an error checker adapted to use the check data of at least one of the entered error-detectable key fragments *to detect if the entered error-detectable key fragment is entered incorrectly*” and “an accumulator adapted to defragment the key data of the entered error-detectable key fragments into the *reconstituted key string* and provide the reconstituted key string.” (*See*, Applicants’ claim 47 above; emphasis added). The Office Action alleges that Butler teaches these features. (*See*, Office Action, page 6). Applicants respectively disagree that Butler teaches any of the claim features for the following reasons. First, Butler does not have an error checker to detect if the entered error-detectable key fragments are entered incorrectly as claimed. Instead, Butler fails to even teach or suggest an error-detectable key fragment for the reasons stated above in paragraph 7. Further, the error checker of Butler, *i.e.* the user, does not determine if the error-detectable key fragments are entered correctly, but determines whether the combination of words corresponds to an entered password. (*See*, Butler Col. 5, lines 20-27). Second, Butler does not use an accumulator to defragment the key data of entered error-detectable key fragments into the reconstituted key string. The Office Action cites reference no. 214 in FIG. 2 of Butler for this feature. (*See*, Office Action, page 6). However, reference no. 214 is the words from the look-up table that are combined and presented to the user. (*See*, Butler Col. 5, lines 20-27). The combined words of Butler do not reconstitute the key string as claimed. Therefore, nothing in Butler teaches or suggests any of the recited features of claim 47 and therefore claim 47 is patentable over Butler.

11. Independent claims 49, 53 and 55 contain similar claim features and are patentable over Butler for similar reasons as claim 47.

12. In addition, independent claims 1, 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated over Schroeder. Independent claim 1

currently recites the steps of “*fragmenting the original key string* into a plurality of key fragments,” “calculating for each key fragment corresponding check data” and “*combining each key fragment with its corresponding check data* to form said error-detectable key fragments.” (See, Applicants’ claim 1 above; emphasis added). The Office Action alleges that Schroeder teaches these steps. (See, Office Action, page 7). Applicants respectively disagree that Schroeder teaches any of the claim steps for the following reasons. First, Schroeder is a method for improving error control over packets in a communication network. (See, Schroeder, para. 8). The packets of Schroeder are data that is sent between computers, *i.e.* e-mail, and not an original license key as claimed. Further, the cited portion of Schroeder reproduced in the Office Action clearly shows that a partial error control value is calculated for each packet fragment and all error control values are added to provide a TCP checksum. (See, Schroeder, para. 29). Nothing in Schroeder combines the check data with the key fragment to form error-detectable key fragments as claimed. Therefore, nothing in Schroeder teaches or suggests any of the recited features of claim 1 and therefore claim 1 is patentable over Schroeder.

13. Independent claims 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55 contain similar claim features and are patentable over Schroeder for similar reasons as claim 1.

14. Further, the Office Action appears to have made an omnibus rejection and failed to address several features of the claims. The MPEP instructs Examiners that omnibus rejections are not informative. (See, MPEP § 707.07(d)). The rejection of claims 1-12 and 14-56 only addresses claimed steps of claim 1 and fails to consider any other feature. This rejection is wholly informative and thus an improper omnibus rejection. For example, independent claim 47 recited the feature of “an error checker adapted to use the check data of at least one of the entered error-detectable key fragments to detect if the entered error-detectable key fragment is entered incorrectly.” (See, Applicants’ Claim 47, above). In addition, independent claim 55 recites the feature of “an error message generator configured to provide to a user interface a message that identifies a portion of the entered key fragment that was entered incorrectly.” (See, Applicants’ Claim 55, above). The Office Action fails to address these features other features of independent claims 14, 28, 35, 45, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55, and fails to state where, if anywhere, these features are found in Schroeder. Therefore, the rejection of claims 2-12 and 14-56 by Schroeder is also an improper omnibus rejection and should be withdrawn.


***Dependent Claims***

15. The dependent claims incorporate all of the subject matter of their respective independent claims and add additional subject matter which makes them *a fortiori* independently patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the outstanding rejections of the dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

***Conclusion***

16. In view of the foregoing, this application should be in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael G. Verga  
Reg. No. 39,410  
Tel. (703) 563-2005

December 19, 2006